

ROBERT CRADDOCK.

MARCH 3, 1836.

Read, and laid upon the table.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Revolutionary Claims, made the following

REPORT:

The Committee on Revolutionary Claims, to which was referred the petition of Robert Craddock, respectfully report:

The petitioner claims monthly pay and rations as lieutenant, from the 1st of January, 1783, until the 15th November, 1783, when the proclamation for disbanding the army was promulgated. He also claims compensation for the services of and forage for two horses, from the 8th of October, 1782, until the 15th July, 1783, and rations for his waiter or servant, from the 1st of Jan. 1783, until the 15th July, 1783. The petitioner states, that in October, 1782, he was ordered by Col. Posey to remain and take charge of the sick in the hospital at his camp in South Carolina, at Ashley Hill, and as the soldiers recovered, to grant them such permits as would enable them to travel to Cumberland old court-house in Virginia, and to draw rations at the different posts on the way. The petitioner was required, as he states, to follow after and to procure discharges from some general or field officer, for the soldiers when they reached Cumberland old court-house. In obedience to these orders, the petitioner states he entered on the discharge of the duties assigned him, about the 8th day of October, 1782, and continued in service before they were completed up to the 15th of July, 1783.

The petitioner states that Andrew Dunscomb, agent for the Government, in settling the accounts of the Virginia continental line, to which the petitioner belonged, stopped his pay, &c. on the 10th of September, 1782, although he was then in actual service and command at the south.

The petitioner states, that in 1794, through the aid of C. Greenup, then a member of Congress from Kentucky, (where the petitioner then and has ever since lived,) he obtained at the war office an additional allowance for his pay and rations up to the 1st of January, 1783.

It appears that the petitioner on the 19th September, 1793, for the purpose of obtaining evidence on which to sustain an additional claim against Government, wrote a letter to Brigadier General Thomas Posey, in which letter the petitioner complains that Mr. Dunscomb had not allowed him pay for four months in 1782, "and one at least in 1783, which ought to have been taken into the account and admitted." The letter then proceeds to say: "This error having lately been discovered, no application

has been heretofore made, and I am advised a certificate from you will be necessary in accomplishing the object when applied for." The petitioner then details the facts in his letter which he desires General Posey to certify to be true. The statement in the letter is substantially this: That the petitioner was to have marched with the men commanded by General Posey, from Ashley Hill, South Carolina, to Virginia, on the 2d day of October, 1782, but did not, owing to his absence on a separate command at Rutledge's plantation on Stone river. On his return to camp at Ashley Hill, he received the orders already mentioned. The letter states: "In obedience to this, your order, I was detained until the 5th of January, 1783, and did not arrive at home until the 29th of the same month; after which, I was several times at the old court-house to finish the business I had in charge. While I remained in the neighborhood of the army, I drew rations for self and waiter, and at Camden and Salisbury, for a few days that I necessarily was detained, also a few days' forage at those towns, but nowhere else."

General Posey endorses the letter as follows: To the best of my recollection, the within circumstances, as related by Lieutenant Robert Craddock, are just. The orders alluded to were given by me, and the dates as stated no doubt are right.

February, 1794.

THOMAS POSEY,
Brigadier General.

The committee are of opinion that there would be no propriety in allowing compensation to the petitioner for services beyond those claimed in his letter to General Posey, of 1793. By that letter he only claims pay for four months in 1782, and (by strong inference) one month in 1783; for his complaint as to Dunscomb's settlement is, that he should have allowed pay for four months in 1782, and at least one month in 1783, when he did not. As the petitioner was allowed by the settlement in 1794 pay up to the 1st of January, 1783, his claim, according to the letter, is reduced to one month. The petitioner admits in his letter of 1793, that he drew rations for himself and waiter while in the neighborhood of the army and at Camden and Salisbury for a few days, "also a few days' forage at those towns, but nowhere else." As the petitioner admits he received a partial supply of rations and forage, and as in the opinion of the committee the amount due him for pay, rations and forage, if any thing, must be trifling, as there is no evidence showing how long the petitioner remained in active service, and as the Government acted upon the claims for additional compensation as far back as 1794, and then made an additional allowance, the committee think the claim of the petitioner is not sustained, and therefore

report the following resolution:

Resolved, that the petition of Robert Craddock be not granted.